

REMARKS

Claims 6-16 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 14 and 15 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to more appropriately recite the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections. Based on the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to claim 16; rejected claims 6, 7, 9, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakui (USP 5,648,816) in view of Sasson (USP 5,016,107) and further in view of Kikinis (USP 5,835,732); and rejected claims 8, 10, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasson, Wakui and Kikinis and further in view of Watanabe (USP 4,887,161). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for the Interview conducted on August 26, 2009. During the Interview, the parties discussed the differences between the claimed invention and the cited art. The parties further discussed minor amendments to the claims to clarify the claimed invention. The parties agreed that minor amendments as discussed during the Interview would be entered and considered after final.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments and arguments here are made further to the discussion during the Interview.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 16 asserting it is dependent on a cancelled claim. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 16 to depend from independent claim 6. Based on the amendment made herein, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 6 to recite, *inter alia*, memory control means for, when said detecting means detects said insertion of the detachable memory card, directly and automatically transferring the image data from said built-in, non-volatile memory to said detachable memory card. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment is minor and does not change the scope of the claim. As agreed upon during the Interview, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner enter and consider the amendment herein after final.

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 6, the Examiner seeks to modify the teachings of Wakui with the purported teachings of Sasson in order to teach the memory control means as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Kikinis are insufficient to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Wakui,

The disclosure of Kikinis is directed to a μ PDA that may be docked with a host computer. The μ PDA is a computing device having a central processing unit which is connected to the host computer through a host interface. Thus, the teachings of Kikinis are merely directed to communication between two computing devices. The PCMCIA disclosed in Kikinis is merely directed to the form factor of the μ PDA in Kikinis. The μ PDA is a computing device, not a memory card, as required by the claimed invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Kikinis fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Wakui and Sasson by failing to teach or suggest memory control means for, when said detecting means detects said insertion of the detachable memory card, directly and

automatically transferring the image data from said built-in, non-volatile memory to said detachable memory card.

For at least these reasons, and as agreed upon during the Interview, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 7-13 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 6 at least based on their dependency on claim 6. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 14 and 15 have been similarly amended and include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 6. As such, claims 14 and 15 are allowable over the art as cited.

As agreed upon during the Interview, Applicant respectfully requests the amendments made herein be entered and considered after final. Further, as agreed upon during the Interview, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 31, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Catherine M. Voisinet

Registration No.: 52,327

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant